PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I have laid on Table :

(*a*) the Schedule of Demands for Supplementary and Additional Grants for the year 1954-55.

(*b*) the list of promises made by Government during Budget Session of Legislative Assembly, 1953 and action taken thereon.

Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—Sir, I lay on the Table :

(*a*) copies of Notifications Nos. L. 1859—ML. 123-3-3, dated 22nd May 1954 and L. B. 2907—V.P. 40-54-2, dated 16th June 1954, issued under the Cattle Trespass Act, 1871 ;

(*b*) copy of Notification No. T. 1330—R.T. 158-53-17, dated 25th June 1954, issued under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939.

PRESENTATION OF REPORTS.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I beg to present the report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Appropriation Account of 1950-51 and the Audit Report, 1952 and Finance Accounts, 1950-51 and the Audit Report, 1951.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Chairman, Estimates Committee).—Sir, I beg to present the second report of the Estimates Committee.

MYSORE BOARD OF REVENUE BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Board of Revenue Bill, 1954 be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a very important measure. Till now there were no statutory bodies in Mysore to dispose of revenue and other appeals that came up before Government. The Revenue Minister and other Ministers are exercising the appellate powers under the Land Revenue Code and various other enactments. The bulk of the appeals has gone up to such on extent that the Minister whose main responsibility is to lay down policies cannot dispose of these cases and he cannot find adequate time to hear and dispose them of. Sir, in the year 1952-53 the Government received 464 appeals. In the year 1953-54, 464 appeals were received. In the year 1954-55, up-to-date, we have received 311 appeals. In the year 1952-53, 48 Muzrai appeals were instituted ; in the year 1953-54, 40 appeals were received and in 1954-55 so far we have received 18 appeals. When I took charge, the opening balance was 354 and that year 465 were instituted, out of which 448 were disposed of. Added to it, the Revenue Minister is required to dispose of sales-tax revision petitions and tenancy revisions. In the year 1952-53, 225 revision petitions were instituted. In the year 1953-54, 120 petitions were entertained. This year, so far 70 have been entertained. Hon'ble Members can just imagine the volume of work that a Revenue Minister is required to do. He has to hear the appeals and write judgments.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narasipur).—Why do you take the trouble ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—To avoid that trouble I have brought this Bill before you so that you may give your consent very early.

1-30 P.M.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—On a point of clarification, I want to seek some information at the hands of the Revenue Minister. Does this Board take the place of the Government or of the Revenue Commissioner or the Excise Commissioner ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I will explain. The Bill proposes to constitute a Board which will consist of the Revenue Commissioner, the Excise Commissioner and the Commissioner for Local Self-Government and any other officer if the Government deem fit to appoint. The Board will exercise all the appellate and revisional powers

(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)

exercisable by the Revenue Commissioner, the Muzrai Commissioner, the Commissioner for Land Records, the Excise Commissioner, the Commissioner for Sales Tax, the Commissioner for Local Self-Government and the Commissioner for Stamps. It will also exercise all appellate and revisional powers exercisable by the Government under various other enactments against the original orders passed by the Revenue Commissioner, the Muzrai Commissioner, the Commissioner for Land Records, the Excise Commissioner, the Commissioner for Sales Tax and the Commissioner for Local Self-Government. The Board will also exercise such other powers as may be assigned to it under any enactment. Government may, subject to such conditions, confer or entrust upon the Board additional powers and functions. It is proposed to provide for calling reports from the Board wherever the Government finds it necessary. How the Board has to exercise the powers will be matters which will be described in the rules. Provision for revision against the orders of the Board to the Government is provided for in some cases.

There is also provision for the Board to review its own orders in certain circumstances. I think this is a non-controversial measure. It is necessary in the interest of the general public as well as in the interest of the Government itself. I hope that this measure will get your unanimous approval.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

Accident during Dasara Procession.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I think we will now take up the adjournment motion. I will read it once again for the benefit of the Hon'ble Home Minister.

This adjournment motion has been tabled by Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy. It is as follows :—

> "This House do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, to wit, the failure of the Government to take adequate steps during the Dasara procession at Mysore on the 7th October 1954, resulting in the death of one person and several injured."

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY rose)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Minister wants to make a statement before I decide upon the admissibility or otherwise of the motion, I would like to hear him first and then the Hon'ble Member.

SRI H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Maddur).—Sir, on a point of clarification. It is doubtful whether the matter is placed before the House at all, because the Chair has not admitted it as yet.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have not admitted it as yet.

SRI H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—So, is it not better for us to listen first to the mover of the motion and then the Home Minister may make a statement ? There is nothing for the Home Minister to make a statement now without our knowing what the facts are.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—My difficulty is this. Supposing the Home Minister makes a statement satisfactory to the mover, then he may not press for its admissibility—I do not know. If he convinces him, then there will be no need for him to move his motion. So, it is better that the concerned Minister makes a statement on such an important adjournment motion tabled. It is the Minister who will be in a position to make a statement. In spite of the statement, if the mover still wants to press his motion on his own grounds, then the Chair will be in a position to give a ruling. But, if according to you, the mover is given an opportunity now to speak, then again the Minister may want an opportunity to make a statement and then upon that statement the mover may like to say something more. That is why I say.....

SRI H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—But, a discussion may ensue on the statement by the Minister.